



**Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.**  
Commissioner of Education  
Tel. 603-271-3144

**Paul K. Leather**  
Deputy Commissioner  
Tel. 603-271-3801

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, N.H. 03301  
FAX 603-271-1953  
Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900**



**♦ MINUTES ♦**  
**10th Meeting for Phase II**  
May 1, 2012  
Londergan Hall ♦ Room 15

**Carol Kierstead**

The meeting began at 4:15 pm with Carol welcoming everyone. Carol then stated that the focus of the meeting today is to discuss the work that still needs to be done before the Phase II Task Force work is complete, to set the next two meeting dates and to focus on the work that needs to get done today, which is about the specific measurements and elements (Student Learning Objectives) of the state model system. Carol stated that the work that has been done so far has been remarkable and that the group has developed a state model system which will then be communicated to the Commissioner as the recommendation of the Task Force. Carol said we still need to talk about the consequence part of the system. What does it mean when all of these pieces of the system are enacted in New Hampshire? If this is the state model system, what will be some of the implementation supports that will be necessary for the state to consider?

The next meeting date will be Monday, May 21, 2012, from 4:00 pm – 6:30 pm at the Walker Building, room 100. Directions will be sent to everyone before the meeting. It is also proposed that we have a meeting on Tuesday, June 19, 2012, from 9:00 am – 4:00 pm. If you cannot make it all day, please come for part of it if you are able.

**Commissioner Barry**

Commissioner Barry updated everyone regarding the meetings with CCSO and the superintendents about the waiver. She said that the meetings were quite positive.

## **Scott Marion**

Scott started by saying that only the SIG schools have spent time dealing with the Student Learning Objectives. We will be talking about SLO's tonight. Scott then began his PowerPoint presentation *"Incorporating Measures of Student Growth in Educator Evaluation"*. This presentation covered Student Growth Percentiles and their use in school and educator accountability, Shared Attribution and Student Learning Objectives.

Scott then let everyone know that they would be doing some individual work by re-reading the SLO draft and jotting down their initial thoughts in response to the following questions:

- How specific or general do we want to make this?
  - What is the "grain size"?
- What are your questions/concerns?
- What are some implications for developing implementation support and guidance?

## **Carol Kierstead**

Carol asked that everyone re-organize themselves in four groups of 4-5 so that after the individual work is done, they can do some group work. Everyone then read the document "Student Learning Objective Guidance for a State Model System". Once the groups had completed the individual reading, they discussed their group's topic and listed their feedback on flowcharts. The feedback from the four groups is as follows:

### **Group I: The Objectives**

1. Specifics:
  - a. Vague → Add samples
  - b. Start with end in mind
  - c. Should have collaboration
  - d. Highlight group work
  - e. Close to the student as possible
  - f. Two levels of SLO's (?)
    - i. Individual/Building
  - g. Missing piece individual learning plan
2. Questions/Concerns:
  - a. Domains need to be spelled out for subject area (?)
3. Implications:
  - a. New Hampshire language should be added to the document to create working draft for New Hampshire

### **Group II: The Objective Setting Process**

1. Has to be a team effort
2. Focus on both content and learning process
3. Attention to balance of content expertise and development issues
4. Concerns:
  - a. Rigor, comparability, establishing SLO's
  - b. Consistency
  - c. Role of the team
  - d. Clarity of language describing the process
  - e. Bullets for examples would help
5. Implementation Support

- a. Teams across the state
- b. Community Networks
- c. Teacher Prep programs

### **Group III: Assessments/Measures**

There was no written feedback from this group.

### **Group IV: Oversight and Support**

1. Specific or general?
  - a. Too big = No guidance
  - b. Too small = Too restrictive
2. Grain Size: Medium
  - a. Need specificity at state level, guidelines at district level
  - b. Menu to choose from
  - c. Creation of shared resources
3. Questions/Concerns:
  - a. High/middle school → Related to course competencies
  - b. Elementary → Core Fundamentals
  - c. Is it possible to look at “regions” within the state?
  - d. Effective use of technology
  - e. Train the trainer model, mentors?
  - f. Pilots based on district size

### **Scott Marion**

Scott asked for feedback on the level of specificity. One group felt that we would probably benefit from more specificity. That group also felt that there should be examples of how this will look and work. Scott then asked if the requirements of the districts are too specific. It was suggested that two SLO's was too few and there should be more, some individual and some collaborative. Scott asked if 2/3 of the SLO's should be collaborative. Scott then said that perhaps as a state model we should make it as specific as we can agree upon because it is still not going to be a requirement for districts to take this and use it exactly the way it is written. Other people thought that we should try to reach a middle ground where it was not too general and not too specific.

Group III (Assessments/Measures) stated that they had difficulty writing their feedback on the flip chart because they said that we are being asked to develop a reliable and valid measure in the non-tested subject areas. There will need to be flexibility and the grain size will be at the school level, not the state level. How do you develop a reliable and valid measure that cuts across individuals and can say whether or not that teacher helped that person get to that? The best you could hope for is some sort of menu of parameters.

One group stated that we really need to make it so that all of those things that we are currently doing are included in this document. The document needs to reference competencies, Common Core state standards and professional development. A professional development plan and an evaluation plan are not two separate entities. They need to meet, which means that the SLO's part of the evaluation plan needs to meet.

**Scott Marion**

Scott reminded the group that we are meeting again on May 21<sup>st</sup> and June 19<sup>th</sup>. Scott said that the focus of the next meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup> is to discuss what happens as a result of the evaluation (the support, the consequences, etc.).

**Commissioner Barry**

Commissioner Barry ended the meeting by letting the group know that New Hampshire was identified as the most innovative state in the country by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). It was a unanimous decision by all of the states.

The meeting ended at 6:38 pm.

*Submitted by Trisha Allen*

*May 9, 2012*

DRAFT